

The minutes reflect the impressions of the writer, of the discussions and proposals and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the specifications to determine MDT requirements.

June 13, 2007  
MCA-MDT Technical Committee Meeting

Glen Frost opened the meeting with introductions. MCA pointed out the anti-trust policy included with the attendance sheet, and reminded members to read and abide by the policy.

**MDT NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Summary of Specification Revisions.** MDT advised that numerous proposed revisions were in the process. MDT provided a brief explanation of each proposed revision. MCA questioned the change to “mixing at the point of manufacturer” in the proposed revision to 409.03.6 Application of Fog Seal. MCA will provide their specific concerns to MDT in writing. MCA also expressed a concern about the height requirements for Mailboxes (not part of the proposed revisions). MDT will research and provide an update at the next meeting.

**2. MPDES Permit Application.** DEQ is holding a short training session at 1pm today on the new MPDES Construction General Permit at the MCA office. There will be some MDT representatives present. Additional training is being looked into for later this year.

**3. Erosion Controls – BMP’s.** MDT is looking into Lump Sum Erosion Control. This would not be implemented right away; 6-12 months would be the approximate time frame. If there is a substantial increase in the amount of BMP’s used this time frame would be accelerated. MCA will put together some of their concerns in writing and send them to MDT. It was noted Wyoming DOT uses Lump Sum Erosion Control. MCA also asked a question about the time frame for turning the permit over to MDT Maintenance. MDT stated the current process likely would not change; the permit is transferred after all items from the SWPPP Final Inspection are completed. MDT also pointed out the issues with the current way the Erosion Control Plans are completed and the fact that this does not follow EPA’s guidelines. The Contractors will need to provide specific BMP’s that will be used on the project.

**3. Subcontracts.** MDT advised that the Subcontract Requirements in the Construction Memo dated March 29, 2006 are still in effect. MCA expressed concern that the requirements are not clear and clarification needs to be provided from MDT. MCA gave 3 examples to make subcontract requirements clearer: Use a specific dollar amount threshold to indicate when an approved subcontract is required; Develop a list of pre-approved subcontractors; or Develop a list of items that do not require an approved subcontract. MDT will provide more information at the next meeting.

**4. Supplemental Detailed Drawings.** MDT handed out a draft example of the proposed new process for handling text-only revisions. No further discussion resulted.

**5. Hauling of Millings.** MDT asked if the Contractors preferred millings to become the Contractors property or for the millings to be hauled to a location specified in the contract. The Contractors stated it is very project specific when the millings can be sold or given to another entity, sometimes the millings can’t be given away. It was noted the Counties need to budget ahead of time to have the money and equipment to be able to handle the millings. MCA suggested there be some kind of state funded grant set aside for Counties to tap into to be able to use the millings. This is a valuable resource for the state transportation system that is not being utilized to its full potential. MDT will discuss further and provide more information at the next meeting.

**6. FHWA Form 47.** MDT stated Form 47 is being removed. A statewide change order will be written eliminating the form from current contracts.

The minutes reflect the impressions of the writer, of the discussions and proposals and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the specifications to determine MDT requirements.

**7. Transport Electronic Bidding Web Page.** MDT distributed a handout showing the new Contractors Web Page and the location of the Transport Electronic Bidding program.

### **NEW BUSINESS FROM MCA**

**1. Miscellaneous Work.** MCA stated the Miscellaneous Work bid item quantity seems to be out of proportion compared to the overall project costs.

**2. Subcontracts.** Already discussed in MDT new business.

**3. Lump Sum Erosion Control.** Already discussed in MDT new business.

**4. Drilled Shafts Specification.** MCA distributed a letter for a proposed change to the Drilled Shaft special provision. MCA expressed concern with the current special provision if they are required to drill deeper than is shown in the plans. The price increases as the drilling gets deeper and becomes more difficult or they may need additional casing. With the current special provision the additional depth is paid at the unit bid price. The proposed change is to pay by agreed price or force account for additional depth of drilling beyond that shown in the plans. MDT will look at the proposed spec change and provide more information at the next meeting.

**5. QPL.** MCA pointed out there are only 7 items on the QPL and asked what suppliers need to do to get on the list. The web page has the form required to be submitted and the contact names and numbers at MDT.

**6. Geogrid.** MCA expressed concern about the current geogrid requirements. MDT is researching and will be modifying the requirements. MDT will provide an update at the next meeting.

**7. Lump Sum Traffic Control.** MCA asked if anything was happening with going to Lump Sum Traffic Control. Nothing new from MDT.

**8. Plant mix leveling quantity.** MCA asked how MDT figures the leveling quantities for projects and explained it is difficult to achieve the ride spec on certain projects. MDT explained the intent of the leveling quantity and how it is figured. If the contractor feels there is inadequate leveling on a project it should be addressed through the Q&A system prior to the letting.

### **AGENDA ITEMS**

**1. Mobilization.** The special provision placing a cap on the percent that can be bid for mobilization is on hold.

**2. Micro-Deval.** MDT explained the proposed process for using the Micro-deval test and then using sulfate soundness when the Micro-deval results fall into a questionable range. Micro-deval is the preferred test and solves two main problems; the repeatability and the turn-around time. A draft specification will be written and distributed for comment.

**3. Submission of Bid Documentation.** MDT explained the new special provision for Submission of Bid Documentation. MCA expressed concern over the turn around time for submitting the documentation from 7 days to 3 days.

**4. Grade S RAP Specification.** MDT is still working on the specification. Remove from next months agenda.

The minutes reflect the impressions of the writer, of the discussions and proposals and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the specifications to determine MDT requirements.

**5. Buy America.** A draft specification revision will be distributed for comment. Remove from next months agenda.

**6. High Sulfate Soils – application to other concrete items.** The high sulfate and low sulfate soils special provision written for concrete pipes will be expanded to include other concrete items that are in contact with the soils. An update will be provided at the next meeting.

**7. Flexible Delineators.** MDT is working on revising the requirements for Flexible Delineators. MCA will try to send feedback to MDT to clarify what they are asking.

**8. Type 9 Sheeting.** MDT is working on revising. An update will be provided at the next meeting.

Meetings will be on the second Wednesday of each month from 10:00 to 11:00.

*The next meeting will be July 11, 2007, beginning at 10:00 a.m. at the MCA Office.*